



CTB



ANNUAL REPORT- STUDY AND EXPERTISE FUND 2012 INTERVENTION ...

Insert your image here

ACRONYMS	3
1 INTERVENTION AT A GLANCE	4
1.1 INTERVENTION FORM.....	4
1.2 BUDGET EXECUTION.....	4
2 CONTEXT	5
2.1 GENERAL CONTEXT	5
2.2 MANAGEMENT CONTEXT: EXECUTION MODALITIES	5
2.3 HARMO-CONTEXT	6
3 ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS MADE.....	7
3.1 STUDIES.....	7
3.1.1 <i>Progress of studies</i>	7
3.1.2 <i>Analysis of studies completed</i>	7
3.2 EXPERTISE	8
3.2.1 <i>Progress of expertise</i>	8
3.2.2 <i>Analysis of expertise</i>	8
3.3 BUDGET EXECUTION.....	8
3.4 QUALITY CRITERIA	9
3.5 RISK MANAGEMENT.....	10
4 STEERING AND LEARNING	12
4.1 ACTION PLAN	12
4.2 LESSONS LEARNED.....	12
5 ANNEXES	13
5.1 “BUDGET VERSUS CURRENT (Y – M)” REPORT	13
5.2 DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE JLCB AND FOLLOW-UP	13

1 Intervention at a glance

1.1 Intervention form

Intervention name	Mozambique –Belgium Consultancy Fund
Intervention Code	MOZ 01003
Location	Mozambique
Budget	€0.5m
Partner Institution	Benefiting Government Institutions
Date of implementation Agreement	05 Mai 2002 extended in August 2006 up to 2008 and again re-extended up to May 2012
Duration (months)	48 months (extended in 2006 for additional 24 months and then again in 2008 for 48 months)
Objective	Financing in full or in part studies and consultancies in the framework of the Belgian-Mozambican Development Co-operation, including identification, preparation and follow up studies of projects and programmes, investigations, missions, seminars, audits, evaluations and services

1.2 Budget execution

Total Budget	Expenditure year N	Balance	Total Disbursement rate
€ 500.000,00	27,035.33	€ 287,653	57%

Neto Novela (Co-Authorizing Officer)- Ministry of Foreign Affairs- MINEC)

National execution official ¹	BTC execution official ²

¹ Name and Signature

² Name and Signature

2 Context

2.1 General context

Describe any important general contextual elements that have had an important influence (positive or negative) on the intervention. These events should have occurred during the reporting period and can relate to changes in institutional contexts, sector policies, decentralisation and deconcentration policies, major political events, etc. Limit yourself to the description of key evolutions during the reporting period, if any.

Max length: 250 words

In May 2002, a Specific Agreement concerning the creation of the Fund was signed by both parties. Due to different interpretations of agreed modalities under the General Agreement on Co-operation between the Parties signed on 11 May 2001 and in light of a request from Mozambican authorities, an exchange of letters was then proposed in April 2005, which however only entered into force as from May 2006, when MINEC eventually appointed a Fund Co-Director (being the Deputy Director of the Admin. & Finances Directorate), who together with the BTC Resident Representative would manage the Fund

Therefore, the intervention only started in 2007, when the first study was jointly approved by both parties

2.2 Management context: execution modalities

Assess the effects (positive or negative) of the execution modalities on the advancement of the intervention. Provide a score (Very Appropriate, Appropriate, Not appropriate, Not appropriate at all) and comment on the attributed score (current situation, strengths, weaknesses, influence on the progress of the intervention). Limit yourself to the description of key evolutions during the reporting period

Max length: 250 words

The Existing Specific Agreement, which was signed in May 2002, refers to a Co-Managed Fund; however and in accordance with a request from the Mozambican authorities the actual Fund modality is Régie.

Based on the referred exchange of letters from April 2005, MINEC was appointed by the government of Mozambique as its representative, but MINEC only appointed its Representative in 2006. As the Specific Agreement expired in May 2006, the Mozambican authorities requested an extension up to May 2010 and then again until May 2012.

Therefore, the intervention only started in 2007, when the first study was jointly approved by both parties

2.3 Harmo-context

Describe how other actors influenced the intervention and vice versa: harmonisation initiatives with other development actors (or other BTC interventions), the alignment with partner strategies, ownership by the partner. Limit yourself to the description of key evolutions during the reporting period
Max length: 250 words

As per the existing agreement only public institutions (government entities) are eligible to use the fund for undertaking studies jointly approved by DGDC and MINEC. Even though the procurement process is fully managed by the Belgian Technical Cooperation, the preparation of the Terms of Reference for the approved studies is of the responsibility of the beneficiary, who in most cases has not the capacity to develop them, this resulting in delays or cancellations of the tendering process.

There are no other international agencies that are participating as contributors and/or co-financiers of activities of the Fund.

3 Analysis of progress made

3.1 Studies

3.1.1 Progress of studies

Progress of studies ³	A	B	C	D	Comments (only if the value is C or D)
1 Formulation Manager- Programme for Food security in Gaza		X			
2					
3					
4					
5					

3.1.2 Analysis of studies completed

<For every Study that has been completed during the reporting period: fill in a box like the one underneath. You can just copy paste the box for every study. Be succinct>

Title of study:	
<i>Describe, in a few sentences, for who the study was organised, and what it was about</i>	The Study was for SETSAN (Mozambican Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition Issues) and the Belgian Survival Fund
<i>Have the studies been used as intended?</i>	Fully
<i>To what did the study contribute?</i>	To clarify the roles of all and each stakeholder to be involved in the implementation of the Programme for Food Security and Nutrition in the 6 districts of northern Gaza
<i>Issues that arose, influencing factors (positive or negative)? Unexpected results (positive or negative)? How did they impact the study or the use of the study?</i>	<p>Different partners involved in the Programme (One UN – FAO, WFP and UNCDF , FOS and DISOP) with different views/perceptions on how to implement the Programme</p> <p>The study has contributed to the clarification of each ones role and has contributed to the improvement of the formulation of the Programme</p>

³ A: Ahead of schedule
 B: On schedule
 C: Delayed, corrective measures are required.
 D: Seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

3.2 Expertise

3.2.1 Progress of expertise

Progress of expertise ⁴	A	B	C	D	Comments (only if the value is C or D)
1 One Team composed by an International Consultant and a local specialized in Nutrition and fully familiar with the geographical areas	X				
2					
3					
4					
5					

3.2.2 Analysis of expertise

<For every expertise, be it planned, on-going or completed in year N: fill in a box like the one underneath. You can just copy paste the box for every expertise. Be succinct >

Title of expertise – name of expert:	
<i>Describe, in a few sentences, what the expertise is/was about</i>	Was to revisit the Documents already produced by involved parties, analyse existing data and information
<i>To what extent is the expertise delivering results?</i>	Fully in accordance with the ToRs and timely
<i>To what has the expertise contributed?</i>	Revision of the jointly proposed project Document, systematization of data, proposed a new workplan and implementation mechanisms
<i>Issues that arose, influencing factors (positive or negative)? Unexpected results (positive or negative)? How did these impact the expertise and the result of this expertise</i>	

3.3 Budget execution

Add – in annex – the “Budget versus current (y – m)” Report, which includes the data up to 31/12/2012, and refer to the annex here. Comment briefly on this financial report if relevant.

⁴ A: Expertise completed in year N
 B: Expertise ongoing
 C: Expertise in preparatory phase: preparation going as planned (writing ToR, procurement procedure, etc.)
 D: Expertise planned but delayed

3.4 Quality criteria

On the basis of the elements above, attribute a simple A, B, C or D score⁵ to the following criteria

Relevance: The degree to which studies and expertise are in line with local and national priorities

Efficiency: Degree to which studies and expertise have been executed on time and on budget.

Effectiveness: Degree to which studies and expertise actually contribute to their intended objectives

Criteria	Score
Relevance	A
Efficiency	B
Effectiveness	B

⁵

- A: Very good performance
- B: Good performance
- C: Performing with problems, measures should be taken
- D: Not performing/ having major difficulties: measures are necessary

If a criterion cannot be assessed (e.g. because the intervention has only just started), attribute the criteria with an 'X' score. Explain why the criterion has not been assessed.

3.5 Risk management

Provide the evolution of risks⁶ and how they have been managed. Identified risks consist of risks emanating from the TFF and significant risks that have been identified during the implementation of the intervention. Risks can also be identified during the Annual reporting.

- Describe the risk
- Score the probability that the risk might occur: High, Medium, Low
- Score the impact if the risk would occur: High Medium, Low

If a risk is attributed with a High or very high score, detail the measures that have been taken/will be taken and indicate the person/actor responsible.

N/A - Funds on Direct Management (by BTC)

Risk Identification			Risk analysis			Risk Treatment			Follow-up of risks	
Description of Risk	Period of identification	Risk category	Probability	Potential Impact	Total ⁷	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status

⁶ Limit yourself to Development Risks, Reputational Risks

⁷

Potential impact	High	B	C	D
	Medium	A	B	C
	Low	A	A	B
		Low	Medium	High
	Probability			

4 Steering and Learning

4.1 Action Plan

On the basis of the data and analysis above, formulate actions to be taken (/decisions to be taken) These can be both strategic as operational.

Action plan	Source	Actor	Deadline
Description of the action/decision to be taken	The sub-chapter to which the action /decision refers (e.g. 3.2.3)	The person responsible for taking the decision/taking action	e.g. Q1, Q2, Q3 or Q4 of year N+1

4.2 Lessons Learned

Capture important Lessons Learned from the intervention's experience. Lessons Learned are new insights that must remain in the institutional memory of BTC and partners.

Lessons learned	Target audience
Description of the lesson learned. Its very difficult to formulate/implement a programme which involves so many implementing agencies with different visions/missions and views	The audience that may be interested in the lesson learned. BTC/EST, DGCD Government counterparts
An independent consultant can contribute strongly in the clarification of roles of each stakeholder	DGCD Government counterparts BTC/EST
Good knowledge of the geographical/cultural areas of implementation of the programme can contribute to the improvement of the TFF of proposed projects/programme	DGCD Government Counterparts BTC/EST

5 Annexes

5.1 “Budget versus current (y – m)” Report

Provide “Budget versus current (y – m)” Report (this can be annexed to this document and doesn't have to be included in the report as such.)

5.2 Decisions taken by the JLCB and follow-up

Provide an overview of the important strategic decisions taken by the JLCB and the follow-up of those decisions since the beginning of the intervention.

N/A as no JLCB – the study was just to contribute in the improvement of the formulation of the programme

Decision to take					Action			Follow-up	
Decision to take	Period of identification	Timing	Source	Actor	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status